

Rollcall 637, recommitting the legislative appropriations conference report, No;

Rollcall 638, final passage, fiscal year 1996 legislative appropriations conference report, Yes;

Rollcall 639, cutting \$493 million for Stealth bombers, Yes;

Rollcall 640, cutting \$1 billion for F-22 R&D, Yes;

Rollcall 641, supporting abortion rights, Yes;

Rollcall 642, opposing abortion rights, No;

Rollcall 643, cutting intelligence spending, No;

Rollcall 644, cutting 3 percent across the board, Yes;

Rollcall 645, regarding political advocacy, No;

Rollcall 646, final passage, fiscal year 1996 Defense appropriations, No;

Rollcall 647, regarding BRAC recommendations, No; and

Rollcall 648, motion to instruct on Treasury-Postal appropriations, Yes.

THE SCHOOL BASED HEALTH CLINIC ACT

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1995

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to announce the introduction of legislation that is long overdue. The School Based Health Clinic Act ensures that every child shall have access to high quality health care services. I trust that this body will act to ensure prompt passage of this critical bill.

Tragically, over 12 million children, and almost half of all elementary school students, lack access to basic preventative health care such as immunizations and physical exams. The barriers that may stand in their way are inadequate or no health insurance, few available caregivers, and lack of convenient transportation.

This dilemma has caused many communities to establish school based health clinics. These clinics have proven to be very successful in their mission—bringing comprehensive health care to children in need.

Unfortunately, many centers cannot get the funding that they desperately need to continue operating. The School Based Health Center Act will provide seed money for expanding these centers to new communities. My bill will increase access to health services for school kids by requiring that HMO's and other managed care plans provide assistance to school based health centers.

Mr. Speaker, our children are in dire need of health care services. Far too many children are not immunized, they do not receive dental care, and only get to see a doctor in the emergency room. We now have a unique opportunity to make a positive impact on the health and well being of our Nation's most needy children.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in sponsoring this historic piece of legislation, and bring comprehensive health care to children in dire need of care.

THE MEDICARE DEBATE

HON. BRIAN P. BILBRAY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1995

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the following editorial from the San Diego Union Tribune, dated September 22, 1995, be inserted in the RECORD.

THE MEDICARE DEBATE

(By Brian Bilbray)

The current radio and television ad campaign employed to derail Medicare reform efforts reminds me of a B horror movie—a ridiculous script, unbelievable characters and a wildly exaggerated villain. If the big-labor-financed advertisements running against me in San Diego weren't so distorted and outrageous they would be humorous.

But there is nothing funny about the impending bankruptcy of the health-care system upon which 37 million American seniors now depend. However, the distortions and scare tactics surrounding the debate do a great disservice to seniors and those of us in Congress who wish to arrive at a reasonable solution to preserve the system.

As we begin to debate the specifics of Republican proposals to reform Medicare, we will keep in mind what the opponents of Medicare reform have forgotten: The future of Medicare depends upon a dialogue, not a shouting match. The real villains are those who cheapen the debate and contribute no ideas or solutions of their own.

The Medicare Preservation Act of 1995, introduced in the House of Representatives this week, is a starting point for debate, not the final product for reform. Since April, when President Clinton's trustees warned that the system would be bankrupt by the year 2002, I have met with seniors, doctors and hospital administrators in San Diego. They provided me with input and ideas, which have become part of the proposal we are now debating in Congress.

The Republican plan is based upon the belief that individuals will make better choices about their health care than the government. Seniors will be able to choose from the same types of health-care plans now found in the private sector. If a senior is now spending a great deal of out-of-pocket expense on MediGap insurance to cover prescription drugs, he or she can choose not to enroll in "traditional" Medicare and may instead want to pick a plan that includes drug coverage.

Seniors also will have an option of a "MediSave" program, in which a high-deductible policy is purchased and the government deposits money to cover that deductible in an interest-bearing account in a bank of their choice. This gives them complete control over important medical decisions, with their doctors, without worrying about an insurer's or Medicare's payment policies.

The bill introduced this week also exposes the shameless fear tactics of the past few months which have alleged that premium costs for seniors enrolled in Medicare Part B will drastically increase. Today, seniors pay premiums that are 31.5 percent of Part B costs.

Under our proposal, the premiums will continue to be calculated that way, so that they will increase slightly every year, just as they have done since the inception of the program. Beneficiaries will not face any increase in deductibles and co-payments, in contrast to what our critics are claiming.

Under our proposal, doctors and hospitals will be allowed to form provider-service net-

works to cover Medicare benefits, without the insurance company or managed-care company as an intermediary. A group of doctors or hospitals functioning as a network would be required to meet solvency and marketing requirements. Per-beneficiary contributions will be adjusted for age and other factors so that Medicare is providing funds according to need.

The health-care dollars spent by a senior in San Diego may be drastically different than those spent by a senior in Nashua, N.H.—our plan provides for this flexibility. Every Medicare provider must agree to take all applicants and allow participants to stay in the plan as long as they want; no one will be shut out due to an illness or a pre-existing condition.

How do Republicans reduce Medicare's rate of growth—one that has been running at hyperinflationary levels? Two ways: Increased health-care choices for seniors who will spend their dollars more efficiently, and increased competition between providers. In addition, the Medicare Preservation Act will shrink the subsidy Medicare currently provides to more affluent seniors.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, a 65-year-old couple, both retiring this year, will collect \$126,000 more from Medicare than they paid in during their working years.

For millions of seniors, this subsidy is vital to their retirement income security, but this is a luxury the taxpayers cannot afford for wealthier seniors. Single seniors with incomes over \$75,000 and couples with incomes over \$150,000 will begin to pay higher premiums instead of receiving a subsidy from the taxpayers.

The scare tactics and misinformation campaign designed to derail Medicare reform will continue. However, senior participants in the system know that doing nothing to save Medicare is not an option. The calls I have received from seniors in San Diego have been overwhelmingly against the "Mediscare" advertisements.

As one woman from La Jolla asked, "How gullible do the labor unions think we are? Preservation of Medicare means reform, and as long as reform continues to involve dialogue with San Diegans, I have more confidence in the process." I agree, and I urge opponents of Medicare reform to focus on the process of debate, don't further debase the process.

IN MEMORIAM: THE OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT, 1972-95

HON. AMO HOUGHTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1995

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment [OTA], which served the Congress with such great distinction for more than 20 years, will close its doors on September 29, 1995. On behalf of all the Members of this body, I would like to express my deep appreciation to the more than 200 dedicated and talented individuals at OTA who have served us so selflessly. And I want to share with you a brief summary of their accomplishments.

As you know, OTA's job was to provide the Congress with an objective, thorough analysis of many of the critical technical issues of the day. And that it did, examining cutting edge science in medicine, telecommunications, agriculture, materials, transportation, defense, indeed in every discipline and sector important

to the United States. The agency appraised the costs and benefits of diverse technological systems: The computerization plans of Federal agencies; satellite and space systems; methods for managing natural resources; systems for disposing of wastes. The list is endless. But to mention just a few more:

OTA evaluated the environmental impacts of technology and estimated the economic and social impacts of rapid technological change. The agency offered sound principles for coping with, reaping the benefits of, that technological change—in industry, in the Federal Government, in the work-place, and in our schools. The agency took on controversial subjects, examining them objectively and comprehensively for our benefit. It help us to better understand complex technical issues by tailoring reports for legislative users. It provided us with early warnings on technology's impacts and it enabled us to better oversee the science and technology programs within the Federal establishment.

While pulling issues down to practical grounds, OTA has usually erred on the optimistic side. For example, OTA regularly spelled out its belief in the power of technology to improve our lives and help solve the Nation's problems. It worked through a basic understanding of how technology works, how institutions need to change to accommodate new technology, how resistant to change such institutions can be when the conditions are wrong, and how swiftly they can adapt when the conditions are right. OTA helped us discover the conditions for change.

A SCOPE WIDE AND DEEP

Once OTA was well underway, it had 30–60 projects in progress, published up to 55 reports, and started approximately 20 new projects each year. Its work ran the gamut of subject matter, with approaches tailored for each topic and congressional request. For example:

In 1975, one OTA program began a comprehensive policy analysis of the Nation's energy future, which it provided incrementally throughout the energy crisis.

Between 1975 and 1980, another OTA group set the stage for today's booming industry in the technology assessment of health care by demonstrating the inadequacy of information on which decisions about technology were made; laying out the strengths and weaknesses of methods to evaluate technology; and crystallizing the process by which economic tradeoffs could be incorporated in decisions.

In 1979, OTA expanded its work in agriculture to include all renewable resources and laid the foundation for others' efforts on sustainable development and, later, ecosystem management.

One OTA group examined each key mode of transportation in turn, focusing especially on urban transportation; better and less expensive ways to move goods; and technologies which used less petroleum. Another OTA program tracked materials through their total life-cycle—from exploration and extraction through production to use, reuse, and eventual disposal. A third investigated policies related to the private use of Federal public lands and other resources, addressing questions of public equity, the responsibility of industry, and the long-term protection of the environment.

In sum, OTA brought new, old important science into the center of many congressional

discussions. At times, OTA took part in high-profile debates on major pieces of legislation such as the 1980 Energy Security Act; Superfund; the Clean Air Act; and the Foreign Assistance Act. Also, the agency contributed to specific technical issues that puzzled nontechnical congressional staff—from risk reform to long-term African development; from acid rain to dismantling nuclear weapons; from the Strategic Defense Initiative to policy body armor. One study on global climate change helped Congress evaluate more than 131 pieces of legislation. At its busiest, OTA's testimony for various committees averaged more than once a week.

The executive branch and State governments were not outside the OTA reach. OTA published the landmark work on computers in schools. This eventually led to support for teachers as the way to make the best investment in technology—a key policy change in education. OTA's repeated work on the farm bill prompted important changes in the U.S. Department of Agriculture. And OTA's comprehensive series of analyses on nuclear waste management set out issues of technology and policy for both industry and the military.

CAREFUL ANALYSIS, SHARED WITH THE WORLD

In the course of every study, OTA accumulated vast amounts of raw information. By a project's completion, OTA had created a report with "value-added." OTA staff excelled at identifying the principal strands of analysis, weighing the evidence of each, and synthesizing essential pieces. The creed of OTA was to come as close as possible to objective analysis. It was a point of pride when reports were cited both by an issue's defenders and its detractors, as happened most recently in debates regarding the North American Free Trade Agreement and Oregon's Medicaid program.

The public and private sectors have recently discovered the benefits of organizing work around functional teams. OTA started with this model. It was used in every project. Team members came from different disciplines and backgrounds, with different experiences and perspectives, yet they always seemed to share a commitment to their product and not incidentally to the American people.

When work took OTA into new subject areas, staff broke ground for new intellectual pursuits. This was true in risk policy. And it was true when OTA developed the analytical methods to identify priorities for agricultural conservation. During OTA's lifetime, "international interdependence" changed from slogan to reality. OTA was ahead of the curve, conducting international case studies and exploring previously ignored aspects of international security. In fact, between 1985 and 1990, OTA's studies of the impacts of technology on the economy, environment, and security of the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe made clear that the demise of centrally planned economies was inevitable.

As a result of all this, OTA gradually became recognized worldwide as the top institution of its kind. Representatives from about one-third of the world's nations visited OTA one or more times to learn how OTA worked; how it became so valuable to Congress and the American people; and how these foreign nations might develop their own "OTA's." Austria, Denmark, the European Community, France, Germany, Great Britain, the Nether-

lands, and Sweden have copied or adapted the OTA style. Similar organizations are being discussed or formed in Hungary, Japan, Mexico, the People's Republic of China, Russia, Switzerland, and Taiwan.

The above is simply the most visible aspect of OTA's international impact. Visitors from other countries stopped by OTA almost every week to discuss specific technologies or technology-related issues. Several OTA staff spoke frequently about OTA in other countries. A number accepted temporary details to academic or government positions overseas. And still others traveled abroad to teach short courses on technology assessment.

THE WRITTEN WORD

In its 24 years, OTA published nearly 750 full assessments, background papers, technical memoranda, case studies, and workshop proceedings. OTA reports were recorded as being "remarkably useful," "thorough," "comprehensive," "rigorous." At their best, OTA reports were among the most cited references on their subjects. "Landmarks," they were called, "definitive," and the "best available primers." From 1992 to 1994, twelve assessments won the National Association for Government Communicator's prestigious Blue Pencil Award, successfully competing against as many as 850 other publications in a single year. In the same 3 years, 12 additional reports were named among the 60 Notable Government Documents selected annually by the American Library Association's Government Documents Round Table—representing the best Federal, State, and local government documents from around the world.

In typical comments, the journal *Foreign Affairs* claimed that, "The Office of Technology Assessment does some of the best writing on security-related technical issues in the United States." A former Deputy U.S. Trade Representative called OTA's 1992 report on trade and the environment, "the Bible." A Senator described OTA's work on the civilian impacts of defense downsizing as " * * * a superb study and the standard by which all similar efforts will be judged." And the head of one state's plant protection agency described OTA's study of non-indigenous species as " * * * a benchmark which will be the most heavily referenced document for years to come."

OTA's reports were often bestsellers at the Government Printing Office and the National Technical Information Service: GPO sold 48,000 OTA reports in 1980 alone. Commercial publishers reprinted at least 65 and translated two reports all or in part. The Superintendent of Documents selected 27 OTA reports to display in the People's Republic of China in 1981. And OTA itself reissued reports that had unusual staying power. For example, OTA's 1975 report on tanker safety and the prevention of oil spills was reissued in 1990 after the *Exxon Valdez* accident. Likewise, OTA combined the summaries of two particularly popular reports—on tropical forests and biological diversity—and reprinted them in 1992.

THE PEOPLE BEHIND THE PROJECTS

OTA staff represented every major field of science and technology, ranging from board-certified internists to Ph.D. physicists. OTA staff were sought out to serve their respective professional associations. A number were elected to offices or boards—the International

Society for Technology Assessment, the International Association for Impact Assessment, the Association for Women in Development, the Ecological Society of America, etc. Two staff formed the Risk Assessment and Policy Association and others went on to found their own companies.

Above all else, OTA staff were teachers. As a result of their efforts, hundreds of thousands of people are better informed not only about science and technology but also about the structure and function of Congress. OTA served 30–60 congressional committee and subcommittees each year. Thirty-one Senators and Representatives had the privilege to serve on OTA's Technology Assessment Board and we became among the Congress' most knowledgeable members on issues of science and technology.

Each year, at least several hundred advisory panelists and workshop participants also took part in OTA's work. Some years, OTA tapped as many as 1,500 leaders from academia, non-governmental groups, State and local governments, and industry. OTA's advisors valued the experience and said it made them more fit for decisionmaking in their own fields. Some were experts; some were stakeholders. Still other were members of the larger public. As early as 1975, OTA incorporated public participation and stakeholder involvement into a major study of offshore energy development. Nearly 15,000 people were involved. Later approximately 800 African farmers and herders were included in an evaluation of the United States-funded African Development Foundation.

In addition, OTA provided 71 scientists and engineers with a challenging and memorable year on Capitol Hill as Morris K. Udall Congressional Fellows or congressional fellows in health policy. Many of OTA's younger employees gained a taste for research—and for public service—at OTA and went on to graduate school to become the next generation of business leaders, scientists, engineers, and policy analysts.

OTA's record depended upon remarkable support staff as much as it did on the agency's analytical staff. Their work was the standard against which other Government agencies were measured—and often found lacking. People came from around the world to attend OTA meetings—and often commented that OTA's workshops were the most well supported, best organized, and most productive they had ever attended. Contractors were gratified by the ease with which their travel arrangements and invoices were handled. OTA processed hundreds of security clearances efficiently and without incident—without which OTA could not have done its work in national defense. Reports sped through OTA's publishing process and grew steadily more attractive through the years. The staff of OTA's Information Center could find even the most obscure research material—and provided a friendly agencywide gathering place. The Information Center, the technical support office, and the agency's electronic dissemination program kept OTA at the cutting edge of technology for research and for public access to the agency's work.

OTA was a small agency. It was a generous place. For some, colleagues became like second families and these relationships extended to committee and personal staffs. Friendship, joy, and grief seemed to be shared without re-

gard to job description. Many at OTA value this legacy as much as any other. But of course, OTA was not perfect. At times, its greatest strengths—flexibility, tolerance, the preponderance of technical skills—became its biggest weaknesses. One outsider looked at OTA's work and commented, "You must have just about the most interesting job there is." I know that many at OTA, for much of their time, felt exactly that way.

Although OTA closes on September 29, 1995, the Congress will continue to benefit from its work. Stark evidence of the dedication of OTA staff is the fact that they continued working to the end. More than 30 reports will be delivered to requesting committees even after the doors are closed.

OTA soon will be a memory, and we will discover what is lost. But we can salvage something. Those of us who have used OTA reports know that most of them have long shelf lives. The really important issues—the issues OTA worked on—do not get solved and go away in one Congress. In January 1996, all of OTA's reports will be issued on CD-ROM—OTA's final legacy. We should be proud of it.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM DESIGNATION ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. JOSEPH P. KENNEDY II

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2274) to amend title 23, United States Code, to designate the National Highway System, and for other purposes.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Lowey zero tolerance amendment to the national highway bill. At last, we have an amendment which will provide a Federal standard for making driving laws consistent with drinking laws. By restoring sensibility to our impaired driving laws, zero tolerance provisions make it illegal for underage persons to drink any amount of alcohol and then drive.

Driving inexperience and risk-taking behavior often leads teens to dangerous driving situations. If alcohol is introduced in the equation, it often becomes a deadly mixture. Research shows that young drivers are particularly susceptible to impaired judgment when driving under the influence of even small amounts of alcohol. A survey of Massachusetts teenagers who admitted consuming five or more drinks showed they were twice as likely to drive 20 miles over the speed limit, run red lights, and make illegal turns—and many without wearing their seat belts.

As of May 1995, 32 States and the District of Columbia have established lower blood alcohol contents [BAC's] for youthful drivers. Such provisions should be indiscriminately applied across all State lines, sending a clear message to our Nation's teens: If you are under 21 years old and are driving with any level of blood alcohol consumption, you will be considered intoxicated and your driver's license will be temporarily revoked.

Each year for the past decade, between 2,400 and 5,400 youths aged 15 to 24 were

killed in alcohol-related crashes. If this amendment were adopted, it is estimated at least 375 single vehicle night fatal crashes would be prevented each year. These are more than just numbers—these are lives.

I applaud my colleague from New York, Ms. LOWEY, for her leadership in offering this amendment. I believe the time has come for us to engage in a national debate over the merits of formulating a new comprehensive alcohol policy. To that end, I am planning to offer a comprehensive alcohol bill in the coming weeks and would encourage my colleagues to lend their support. One provision of this bill parallels the ideas conveyed in the amendment we are debating today—establishing a national zero tolerance law for underage drinking drivers.

Responsible legislating can be manifested in various forms. Passing the Lowey zero tolerance amendment is the responsible thing to do. I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment.

FLOWER SHOW SPONSOR EXHIBITS MORE THAN LOVE OF FLOWERS

HON. SHERWOOD L. BOEHLERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1995

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend to you John Hordines, who sponsors an annual flower show in my district at his farm in East Branch, NY. In his third year of running this flower show, which he does at his own expense, Mr. Hordines will have 31 entries from as far away as Florida and California. He does it for the love of flowers. And it's evident that plenty of people in this country share his enthusiasm, since 20 million Americans raise flowers.

Mr. Hordines shows some qualities that I greatly admire: initiative, self-reliance, and generosity. His flower show, which is only open to amateurs, is a great example of these attributes. I encourage everyone to attend this year's flower show, which will be on October 1.

MORE BEIJING THREATS

HON. DAVID FUNDERBURK

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1995

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the year the House shamelessly handed the aging rulers of Communist China another bloodless victory. The House, the Senate, and the President gleefully renewed legislation granting most favored nation trading status to Red China.

I said then and I say now that kowtowing to the old boys in Beijing is a stain on American honor. Communist China has murdered millions. It runs the world's most sinister and extensive gulag. Its slave camps turn out textiles which put people in my State out of business. It continues systematic persecution of religious and political dissidents. The Beijing rulers even had the gall to arrest Chinese American freedom fighter Harry Wu and then threaten retaliation against American interests because